DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 383 553 SE 056 287

AUTHOR	Stedman, James B.
TITLE	Eisenhower Professional Development Program: Moving beyond Math and Science. CRS Report for Congress.
INSTITUTION	Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. Congressional Research Service.
REPORT NO	CRS-94-846-EPW
PUB DATE	26 Oct 94
NOTE	17p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Programs; *Financial Support; *Mathematics Education; *Professional Development; *School Funds; *Science Education
IDENTIFIERS	Dwight D Eisenhower Math and Science Educ Prog

ABSTRACT

This report provides an analysis of the Eisenhower Professional Development program. It briefly considers the educational context within which the 103d Congress acted to convert the Dwight D. Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Act into the current program covering a much broader array of subject areas and briefly reviews the structure of the program under prior law. Provisions of the current program are delineated with particular attention to the curricular areas covered; the allocation of funding; and activities at the federal, state, local, and higher education levels. Finally, several issues likely to affect future development of the program are analyzed, including the level of the annual appropriation; the ability of local educational agencies to provide high quality, sustained, intensive professional development; and the growing demand for professional development as curriculum content standards are established in each of the core subject areas of English, math, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography. (MKR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SE
94-846 EPW

CRS Report for Congress

ED 383 553

Eisenhower Professional Development Program: Moving Beyond Math and Science

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

James B. Stedman
Specialist in Social Legislation
Education and Public Welfare Division

October 26, 1994

CRS

Congressional Research Service • The Library of Congress

SE056287

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Congressional Research Service works exclusively for the Congress, conducting research, analyzing legislation, and providing information at the request of committees, Members, and their staffs.

The Service makes such research available, without partisan bias, in many forms including studies, reports, compilations, digests, and background briefings. Upon request, CRS assists committees in analyzing legislative proposals and issues, and in assessing the possible effects of these proposals and their alternatives. The Service's senior specialists and subject analysts are also available for personal consultations in their respective fields of expertise.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EISENHOWER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM: MOVING BEYOND MATH AND SCIENCE

SUMMARY

One of the Federal Government's principal programs for strengthening precollege mathematics and science instruction, the Dwight D. Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Act has been converted into the Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development program, which focuses on improving teaching in **all** of the core subject areas, not just mathematics and science. This change was made by the Improving America's Schools Act (IASA), legislation approved by the 103d Congress to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

In addition to covering a much broader array of subject areas than prior law, the program directs a greater share of funding to local educational agencies (LEAs) and a smaller share to institutions of higher education (IHEs) for professional development activities. The program places a greater emphasis on State and local planning of professional development, and supports linkage of Eisenhower activities with State education standards. It newly requires LEAs to share in the cost of Eisenhower activities.

New initiatives are created within the Eisenhower authority. The National Teacher Training Project provides Federal assistance for professional development involving teachers being trained to train other teachers. Another new initiative, the Professional Development Demonstration Project, supports model professional development efforts that will take place in several school districts and States, and involve partnerships among many community entities, including teachers' unions.

Continued from prior law are elements of the program's general structure--a division of appropriated funding into Federal (national) and State components, formula grants to States, allocations to LEAs within States also by formula, and competitive grants to IHEs. Other features reflecting prior law include support for the Eisenhower National Clearinghouse for Mathematics and Science Education, and an emphasis on activities that will increase representation in core academic subjects and in the teaching force of underrepresented groups, such as minorities, women, and the disabled. The IASA continues the Eisenhower Regional Mathematics and Science Education Consortia, although not as part of the Eisenhower program.

A number of issues are likely to affect the program in the near future. These include the adequacy of the annual appropriation; the ability of LEAs to provide high quality, sustained, intensive professional development; and the growing demand for professional development as curriculum content standards are established in the core subject areas. At the heart of these issues is the ability of the program to serve teachers in all of the core subject areas, not just mathematics and science.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

CONTEXT FOR REAUTHORIZATION 1
- Standards-Based Educational Reform 1
- Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Act (Prior Law) 2

PROVISIONS OF CURRENT LAW 2
- Overall Structure of the Program 3
- Authorization of Appropriations 3
- Allocation of Funding 3
  - Mathematics and Science Priority 6
- Federal Activities 6
  - Clearinghouse for Mathematics and Science Education 7
  - National Teacher Training Project 7
- State, Local, and Higher Education Activities 7
  - State Applications and Plans 7
  - State Level Activities 8
  - Local Application and Plan 8
  - Local Cost Sharing 8
  - Local Activities 8
  - Higher Education Activities 9
- Professional Development Demonstration Project 9
- Eisenhower Regional Mathematics and Science Education Consortia . . . 9

ISSUES 10
- Annual Appropriation Level 10
- LEA Success in Supporting High Quality, Sustained, Intensive Professional Development 10
- Demand for Professional Development Arising From New Curriculum Content Standards 11

TABLES

TABLE 1. Allocation of Annual Authorization of Appropriations Provided Under the Eisenhower Professional Development Program and Under Prior Law 5

EISENHOWER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM: MOVING BEYOND MATH AND SCIENCE

INTRODUCTION

This report provides an analysis of the Eisenhower Professional Development program, authorized by title II of the ESEA as amended by the Improving America's Schools Act (P.L. 103-382). It briefly considers the educational context within which the 103d Congress acted to convert the Dwight D. Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Act into the current program and briefly reviews the structure of the program under prior law. Provisions of the current program are delineated with particular attention to the curricular areas covered; the allocation of funding; and activities at the Federal, State, local, and higher education levels. Finally, several issues likely to affect future development of the program are analyzed, including the level of the annual appropriation; the ability of LEAs to provide high quality, sustained, intensive professional development;[1] and the growing demand for professional development as curriculum content standards are established in each of the core subject areas.[2]

CONTEXT FOR REAUTHORIZATION

Standards-Based Educational Reform

During the 103d Congress, efforts to amend and extend the Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Act were influenced by Federal education policymakers' attention to the reforms needed to achieve the National Education Goals, recently codified by the Goals 2000: Educate America Act.[3] Among other objectives to be achieved by the year 2000, these Goals call for improved academic performance by students in a wide range of subject areas, with an emphasis on mathematics and science, and greater support for building teachers' knowledge and skills. Goals 2000 funds State and local efforts to implement systemic education reform that involves, among other activities, the setting of standards for curriculum content and student performance; the development of assessments aligned with those standards; and engagement of communities, schools, districts, and States in reform efforts. Considered critical to systemic reform is extensive, effective professional development of the teaching force.

---

[1]Professional development activities are intended to strengthen the pedagogical skills and knowledge base of elementary and secondary school teachers.

[2]The statute defines the core academic subjects as those listed in a State's Goals 2000 plan or in the third National Education Goal which identifies English, math, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography.

[3]For information on Goals 2000, see: U.S. Library of Congress. Congressional Research Service. *Goals 2000: Overview and Analysis*. CRS Report for Congress No. 94-490 EPW, by James B. Stedman. Washington, 1994.

Also relevant to the congressional deliberations was the ongoing development in many curricular areas of national content standards identifying the important knowledge and skills students should acquire in those core subject areas. Only a few sets of standards have been completed, such as that for mathematics which was prepared under leadership of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics and published in March 1989. Standards development is underway in a host of other curricular areas ranging from the sciences to foreign languages. States are also active in establishing curriculum frameworks and standards. According to those engaged in this process, a key to implementing the standards is a teaching force that has mastered the subject matter and pedagogical skills that undergird them. This mastery of subject matter and teaching skills is likely to be realized, in part, through substantially enhanced professional development.

Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Act (Prior Law)

The Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Act, funded for FY 1994 at $280.9 million, had three major components:

- State formula grants ($251.0 million) for such activities as preservice and inservice training of math and science teachers and recruitment of minority teachers to these fields;

- discretionary grants for programs of national importance ($16.1 million) with special consideration to serving special populations, as well as support for a National Clearinghouse for Science, Mathematics, and Technology Education Materials; and

- grants for Regional Mathematics and Science Education Consortia ($13.9 million) to disseminate math and science education instructional materials and assist classroom teachers in using these materials.

The reach of the program under prior law was broad. According to one analysis, in 1988-89 approximately one-third of all elementary and secondary school teachers having responsibility for math or science instruction participated in an activity funded with Eisenhower State grant monies.[4]

PROVISIONS OF CURRENT LAW

In comparison to provisions of the Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Act, the Eisenhower Professional Development program:

- broadens support for professional development from a focus on instruction in mathematics and science to instruction in the core academic subject areas;

- significantly reduces the relative share of funds flowing to IHEs for professional development activities and increases the LEA share;

---

[4]SRI International. *The Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Program: An Enabling Resource for Reform*. Summary Report. Prepared under contract for the U.S. Department of Education. Washington, 1991.

- emphasizes State and local planning of professional development activities; and
- initiates several new activities to be supported with these funds.

Overall Structure of the Program

The Eisenhower Professional Development program has three primary components:

- grants for Federal activities (title II, part A);
- State formula grants (II,B); and
- the Professional Development Demonstration Project (II,C).

From the Federal activities funds, several programs are to be supported, including an Eisenhower National Clearinghouse for Mathematics and Science Education, and a National Teacher Training Project. Regional Mathematics and Science Education Consortia are not included as part of the Eisenhower program as they were in prior law, but are authorized in a separate title (XIII) of the reauthorized ESEA.

Authorization of Appropriations

For FY 1995, the legislation authorizes $800 million for the Eisenhower Professional Development program; such sums as may be necessary are authorized for the following 4 fiscal years. The FY 1995 appropriations legislation for the U.S. Department of Education (ED, P.L. 103-333) provides $356.7 million for the program in two separate amounts: $320.3 million for State grants and $36.4 million for Federal activities.

Allocation of Funding

Under current law, 5 percent of the annual appropriation is to be used for Federal activities; 94 percent is for State and local activities; and 1 percent (but not to exceed $3.2 million annually) is for the Professional Development Demonstration Project.[5] **From the State and local activities funds**, 0.5 percent is for the outlying areas, 0.5 percent is for schools supported by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), and the remainder is for allocation by formula to the States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

---

[5]Some of these percentage shares are not reflected in the amounts appropriated for FY 1995. As noted above, the FY 1995 appropriations legislation provides funds in two separate amounts: $320,298,000 for State grants (89.8 percent of the aggregate total) and $36,356,000 for Federal activities (10.2 percent). Further, the appropriations conference report (House Report 103-733) states that $5,472,000 of the Federal activities funds is for the National Clearinghouse and $15,000,000 is for the Regional Consortia. The Consortia are authorized in a separate title of the ESEA with a separate authorization of funding. Subtracting the Consortia's funds from the Federal activities funding and the aggregate total yields a net FY 1995 appropriation for the Eisenhower Professional Development program authority of $341,654,000, a Federal activities share of 6.3 percent and a State activities share of 93.7 percent. Determining the funding for the Professional Development Demonstration Project raises some questions. Should the 1 percent for the Project be calculated on the basis of an aggregate appropriation of $356,654,000 or the net aggregate of $341,654,000? Should the Project's funds be drawn proportionately from the Federal activities and State grants, or just from the Federal activities portion? Should any funds be allocated to the Project, given that it was not separately identified by the appropriations legislation or the appropriations conference report?

Prior law divided the annual appropriation somewhat differently, reserving **from the total appropriation** 4 percent for national programs, up to 0.5 percent for the outlying areas, and 0.5 percent for BIA schools.[6] The remainder was for States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

With regard to allocation of funds at the State and local levels, the legislation retains the **general** structure of prior law: appropriated funds are allocated by formula to the States where they are divided between elementary and secondary activities and higher education activities; LEAs' shares of elementary and secondary activities funds are allocated by formula; IHEs' shares of higher education activities funds are awarded competitively; funds for administrative and other activities by SEAs and State higher education agencies (SHEAs) are reserved from the elementary and secondary funds and the higher education funds.

The State allocation formula is basically the same as under prior law: half of the funds are distributed among the States based on their shares of children aged 5 to 17; half are distributed based on the preceding year's allocation of funds under title I, part A of the ESEA.[7] Each State is to receive not less than 0.5 percent of the allocated funds.

The intrastate division of funding was one of the key issues debated during legislative consideration. In particular, the issue was where to strike the balance between the share of State funding for LEAs and the share for IHEs (considered in the Issues section below). As is shown in table 1 below, the LEA share was increased and the IHE share was dropped (the conference report on the legislation, House Report No. 103-761, states that no allocation for higher education activities is to be less than its FY 1994 level).

Table 1 below compares how the authorizing statute divides up Eisenhower funding among the program's various components with the divisions under prior law. **Net** percentages of the annual authorization are shown in this table in parentheses to permit comparison of the **relative** shares distributed to different components. Please note that the net percentages shown are those calculated based upon the provisions of the **authorizing** statute; the actual distribution of **appropriated** funds differed marginally under prior law and is also likely to differ under current law.[8]

---

[6]As with the FY 1995 appropriations legislation, the division under prior **appropriations** legislation differed from the provisions of the prior **authorizing** statute. For example, prior appropriations legislation provided national programs with more than 4 percent of the aggregate total funding.

[7]Title I, part A authorizes the basic, concentration, targeted, and school finance incentive grants of the ESEA's program of compensatory education for educationally disadvantaged students. The allocation of funds under this authority is based on children living in poverty.

[8]The actual shares of the annual appropriation received under prior law differed slightly for some provisions because (1) the annual appropriation was provided in two separate amounts for national and State activities that did not reflect the authorizing statute's specified percentage shares for these activities; and (2) ED applied the reservation for BIA schools and the outlying areas by calculating their percentage shares on the basis of the aggregate of the two annually appropriated amounts, **but** took that amount **only** from the State grant portion. The distribution under the new law will also differ because (1) the appropriation is being provided in two amounts with a portion of the Federal activities funds designated for the Regional Consortia; (2) it is not clear how ED will support the Professional Development Demonstration Project; and (3) the assurance provided by the conference report that higher education activities will not receive less than they received in FY 1994 is likely to raise the higher education activities' net share.

TABLE 1. Allocation of Annual Authorization of Appropriations Provided Under the Eisenhower Professional Development Program and Under Prior Law

(Percentage of annual authorization of appropriations in parentheses)

Provisions	New law	Prior law
Federal (National) activities	5% of appropriation (5%)	4% of appropriation (4%)
BIA schools and outlying areas	1% of State and local activities (0.9%)	1% of appropriation (1%)
Professional development demonstration project	1% of appropriation (1%)	n/a
State and local activities	94% of appropriation (94%)	95% of appropriation (95%)
State allocation	State and local activities minus BIA/outlying (93.1%)	same as State and local activities
Elementary/secondary activities	84% of State allocation (78.2%)	75% of State allocation (71.3%)
LEA activities	95% of elementary/ secondary activities (74.3%)	90% of elementary/ secondary activities (64.1%)
SEA activities	5% of elementary/ secondary activities (3.9%)	10% of elementary/ secondary activities (7.1%)
Higher education activities	16% of State allocation (14.9%)	25% of State allocation (23.8%)
IHE activities	95% of higher education activities (14.2%)	95% of higher education activities (22.6%)
SHEA activities	5% of higher education activities (0.7%)	5% of higher education activities (1.2%)

The formula to allocate funds to LEAs, as changed by the IASA, is likely to direct somewhat larger shares of Eisenhower funding to districts with concentrations of poor children. Half of the funds are allocated based on each LEA's share of public and private elementary and secondary enrollment; the other half of the funds are allocated on the basis of funds received in the previous fiscal year under the ESEA title I program (part A--basic, concentration, targeted, and school finance incentive grants). For the second factor, prior law used the total number of children 5 to 17 years of age from low-income families (the children counted for purposes of the title I program). Actual title I, part A allocations are focused to some degree on districts with concentrations of low-income children (through concentration and targeted grants), rather than being strictly in proportion to the number of such children. As a result, such districts are likely to receive larger shares of Eisenhower funds under current law than they did under prior law.

As under prior law, LEAs receiving small grants are required to form consortia with other LEAs or educational service agencies serving other LEAs. This requirement is applied to any district receiving a grant of less than $10,000; prior law set the threshold at $6,000.

Mathematics and Science Priority

To ensure that Federal support for math and science professional development will continue, even as the coverage of the program is expanded to the core subject areas, the new legislation requires that, **at an annual appropriation for the entire program of less than $250 million**, all funds distributed to LEAs are to be used for math and science professional development.[9] Above that funding level, LEAs **and** SEAs are required to direct to math and science professional development an amount equal to at least what they would receive at an annual appropriation of $250 million, and are permitted and encouraged to use amounts above that level for math and science professional development as well.

Federal Activities

Prior law described national activities supported by the Secretary of Education in relatively little detail. In contrast, current law delineates many activities in detail, distinguishing between those that are required and those that are permitted. The Secretary is **required** to help SEAs and LEAs, among others, develop the capacity to provide "sustained and intensive high-quality professional development;" fund an Eisenhower National Clearinghouse for Mathematics and Science Education (described below); and perform evaluations.

---

[9]The authorizing statute delineates this priority for math and science in section 2206. The reference in the section to LEA share of the State allocation has an erroneous reference (section 2206(a) refers to section 2203(1)(C), a non-existent provision; it should refer to section 2203(1)(B)). That the priority at appropriations below $250 million is to apply only to LEA funds is clear in the conference report. (House Report No. 103-761, p. 679.)

The Secretary is **permitted** to support such entities as clearinghouses in other subject areas, professional development institutes, and professional networks for teachers. Among activities the Secretary may support is dissemination of education standards, and models of how to help teachers meet needs of underserved populations of students. Training in the use of technology and models of teacher recruitment, particularly from underrepresented groups, may also be funded. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards may also be supported.[10]

Clearinghouse for Mathematics and Science Education

The Clearinghouse is a repository of math and science education instructional materials and programs, including, to the extent feasible, all such materials developed with Federal and non-Federal funds. Among new requirements are collaboration with the Regional Consortia (described below) and gathering of evaluation data on items submitted to the Clearinghouse. The Clearinghouse is currently located at Ohio State University, supported by a 5-year grant initiated in 1992.

National Teacher Training Project

The Project, a new activity supported by 5 percent of the Federal activities funds, provides assistance for teacher training programs in one of the core academic subjects and early childhood development.[11] Under this program, teachers are trained and selected to be members of the National Teacher Training Project; they then provide inservice training to other teachers. This effort is modelled after the National Writing Project.[12]

State, Local, and Higher Education Activities

State Applications and Plans

In comparison to prior law, the new law establishes substantially more detailed requirements for States applying for funds. Most significantly, State applications are to include State **plans** to improve teaching and learning. These plans must be coordinated

---

[10]The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards is a private entity developing voluntary, national certification for precollege teachers. In addition to the authority identified above permitting the Secretary to support the Board, Federal funding for the Board is separately authorized under title V of the Higher Education Act. The FY 1995 appropriations legislation provides no funding for this latter authority. The Administration did not request any funding, arguing that the Eisenhower Federal activities authority was more flexible.

[11]The legislation is ambiguous as to whether **each** funded project is to provide training in **both** early childhood development **and** a core subject. It provides that the Secretary is to fund **each** grantee for establishment of programs "in early childhood development **and** one of the nine core subject areas" (section 2103(b)(1), emphasis added). But, the legislation also limits the number of project grants to 10 (section 2103(b(3)) presumably a total reflecting **separate** projects for early childhood education and each of the 9 core subjects. Alternatively, the limit of 10 may be based on the requirement that these grants be awarded in geographically disbursed fashion and that ED divides the U.S. into 10 regions.

[12]The National Writing Project is a program, partially funded by the Federal Government, that teaches writing to teachers and utilizes such teachers to train other teachers.

with State plans under other ESEA programs, Goals 2000, and other Federal legislation, as appropriate. Among other requirements, the State plans are to give all teachers an opportunity to meet State standards; address needs of ESEA title I teachers; address need for greater access to, and participation in, teaching by individuals from historically underrepresented groups; and describe how technology will be used to strengthen professional development.

State Level Activities

From the portion of funds reserved for SEA activities (5 percent of the elementary and secondary portion of the State allocation), SEAs are authorized to support administrative and many other specific activities. Among these activities are reforming teacher licensing requirements; developing teacher performance assessments; supporting professional development networks and partnerships; preparing teachers to use technology; and increasing the number of minorities, disabled, and women teaching in core subjects in which they are underrepresented. Current law is much more detailed in its description of SEA activities than prior law which authorized SEAs to use their funding for a series of demonstration and exemplary programs focused on teacher training in math and science, and historically underrepresented populations.

Local Application and Plan

To receive Eisenhower funding, LEAs must establish performance indicators for improved teaching and learning; conduct a local assessment of professional development needs; and have a professional development **plan**. Among other requirements, this plan must describe how Eisenhower activities will address the needs of teachers in ESEA title I schools; be consistent with State content and student performance standards; support a process sufficiently intense and sustained to have a lasting effect on students' classroom performance; and describe how programs in all core subjects will address the access and participation needs of historically underrepresented groups.

Generally, prior law imposed less specific requirements on local districts applying for funds. It required local districts to assess their needs in these areas. Similar to current law, but within their application and not a local plan, LEAs were to describe how their funds and programs would be coordinated with other resources, as well as provide assurances they were taking into account the needs of underrepresented groups.

Local Cost Sharing

Unlike prior law, participating LEAs are required to meet 33 percent of the cost of the supported activities. SEAs may waive some or all of the cost sharing requirement for districts facing economic hardship.

Local Activities

Any LEA participating in the Eisenhower program must use not less than 80 percent of its allocation for professional development activities that take place in individual schools

and are determined by local teachers and staff. Not more than 20 percent of an LEA's funds can be used for district-level professional development activities. Prior law had no such required division.

Professional development activities supported by a local district's Eisenhower funds must, among other requirements, be tied to State standards. They must also provide teachers with effective ways of meeting the educational needs of diverse groups of students, and must have the intensity and duration necessary to change students' classroom performance. Among permitted activities, LEAs may support partnerships between schools or LEAs and IHEs; local professional development networks; training in use of technology; and professional development and recruitment to increase the presence of underrepresented populations teaching in the core subjects.

Prior law described relatively general uses of funds for LEAs, including expanding and improving teacher training, and recruiting minority teachers into math and science teaching. Each LEA had to assure that its training activities took into account the access and participation needs of underrepresented groups in math and science programs.

Higher Education Activities

The IHE portion of the higher education activities funds is to be awarded competitively by SHEAs to IHEs and nonprofit entities working in cooperation with LEAs, consortia of LEAs, or individual schools. These funds are to support professional development activities in the core academic subjects; assist LEAs and their teachers and staff in providing sustained, high quality professional development; and improve teacher education programs within IHEs.

Prior law also required that higher education funds be awarded competitively, but included only IHEs as potential recipients. Similar to current law, the previous program required IHEs to enter into agreements with LEAs or consortia of LEAs. Authorized activities were more limited under prior law.

Professional Development Demonstration Project

This new authority supports development in several districts and States of models of professional development. Project funds are awarded to partnerships of LEAs or consortia of LEAs. A partnership is to consist of an LEA or a consortium of LEAs, in which at least half of the schools are eligible for ESEA title I schoolwide funding;[13] **or** other specified partners. These other partners **must** include a teachers' union, if appropriate, IHEs, or a local parent or community council; the other partners **may** also include a business or a nonprofit entity. Not less than 75 percent of the Professional Development Demonstration Project funds must be awarded to partnerships serving those schools with the greatest numbers of poor students.

---

[13]A school is eligible for a title I schoolwide project for 1995-96 if at least 60 percent of the children in its attendance area or at least 60 percent of the school's enrollment comes from low-income families. For 1996-97 and subsequent years, the percentage drops to 50.

Eisenhower Regional Mathematics and Science Education Consortia

Support for Eisenhower Regional Mathematics and Science Education Consortia is authorized by title XIII, part C of the reauthorized ESEA. Under the 5-year grants for each Consortia, Federal funds can only meet 80 percent of the cost of eligible activities. Among permitted activities are cooperative efforts with other regional consortia, the Eisenhower National Clearinghouse for Science and Mathematics Education, and federally-funded technical assistance providers; and training and technical assistance for teachers, administrators, and other educators. The annual authorization level is $23 million for FY 1995 and such sums as may be necessary for the next 4 years.

Generally, current law continues provisions in prior law supporting the Regional Consortia. Among the key differences are that prior law included the Regional Consortia as part of the authorizing Eisenhower statute, and the Federal share dropped from 80 percent in the first 2 years of the grant to 50 percent by the 5th year.

ISSUES

Perhaps the most critical change from prior law for the Eisenhower Professional Development program is the expansion of the curricular areas to be served beyond mathematics and science. The impact of this expansion is likely to be at the heart of most issues involving the program for the near future. Among these issues are:

- the annual appropriation level;
- LEA success in supporting high-quality, sustained, intensive professional development; and
- demand for professional development arising from new curriculum content standards.

Annual Appropriation Level

The Administration's original proposal for the professional development program assumed it would have the capacity to serve professional development needs not only in mathematics and science, but also in the rest of the core subject areas, **if** it had a significantly increased annual appropriation. As enacted, the FY 1995 **authorization** level is $800 million. Nevertheless, the FY 1995 **appropriation** level is only $356.7 million (including the funding for the Regional Consortia). Given the statute's reservation for math and science professional development, the current capacity of the program to provide substantial professional development opportunities in the other core subject areas is somewhat limited.

This tension between the expanded reach of the program and the annual appropriation level may continue for the next few years. When first proposed by the Administration, the Eisenhower Professional Development program was expected to benefit in terms of annual appropriation by the termination of the ESEA's chapter 2 State block grant program

($369.5 million in FY 1994). But, as rewritten by the IASA, the ESEA authorizes Innovative Education Program Strategies (title VI), an authority similar to the prior chapter 2 program. Under the FY 1995 ED appropriations legislation, this authority received $347.3 million.

LEA Success in Supporting High Quality, Sustained, Intensive Professional Development

As has already been noted, one of the issues of debate in the legislative consideration of the Eisenhower Professional Development program was the relative balance in shares of the annual appropriation that would support LEA-administered activities and IHE-administered activities. Evaluations of prior law found that activities supported by LEAs with Eisenhower funding were of relatively short duration and of "low-intensity."[14] In contrast, IHEs reportedly conducted Eisenhower activities that served individual teachers for substantially longer periods of time and had a greater prospect of influencing teachers' classroom practice. Nevertheless, the legislative debate centered not on expanding the IHE role, but on increasing the extent to which LEAs administered these funds. The Administration asserted, in support of this focus, that more LEA-level spending would have the beneficial effect of giving teachers direct control over their own professional development. Further, it should be noted that the evaluations did not conclude that LEAs were unable to provide sustained, intensive professional development.

The current legislation clearly intends to direct a substantially greater share of annual funding to activities under the purview of LEAs. It would appear that critical to this shift are new provisions requiring that LEAs' Eisenhower professional development activities be sufficiently intense and sustained to have a lasting impact on students' classroom performance. It is of substantial interest and relevance to the future of the program whether the legislation takes sufficient steps to ensure that professional development of this nature actually will be realized at the LEA level.

Demand for Professional Development Arising From New Curriculum Content Standards

The entire context within which professional development of the elementary and secondary teaching force will be undertaken is changing. In the next few months and years, national curriculum content standards will be established and implementation efforts will be undertaken. States are likely to be increasingly engaged in the process of developing State standards and frameworks. Activities at both of these levels will be supported under the Goals 2000 legislation. If the mathematics standards process is the appropriate model and for many observers it is, the demand for high quality professional development for all members of the current teaching force and high quality preservice

---

[14]This discussion of the findings of evaluations of the Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Act is based on: U.S. Library of Congress. Congressional Research Service. *Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Act: Overview and Issues for Reauthorization*. CRS Report for Congress No. 93-5 EPW, by James B. Stedman. Washington, 1992.

training will rise greatly. The professional development called for in the core subject areas will likely be of a quality and a kind not generally available now.

By expanding its focus beyond math and science, the Eisenhower program is being positioned to play an important role in supporting professional development within that new context. Its capacity to achieve its purposes in all core subjects will be seriously tested in the near future.